

**REMARKS**

In response to the April 15, 2005 Final Office Action, the following is submitted:

Claims 25, 28, and 30 have been newly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Examiner has argued that the recited limitation: “transmitting no cell secession alarm information to the corresponding mobile station upon a determination that the mobile station is not registered in the private radio mobile communications system” is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons:

After carefully reviewing the original application, it appears that the recited limitation in question is supported by the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16 of the original application. Namely, the cited paragraph states: “When the call is an extension call between the registered subscribers, the cell secession alarm operation and process shown in FIG. 2 is performed. Otherwise, when the call is not an extension call between the registered subscribers, a handoff occurs to a neighbor BTS, such as BTS 8, upon detection of the occurrence or expected occurrence of the cell secession.”

Furthermore, the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the original application

indicates that a mobile station not registered in the public/private communications service unit can receive only the public mobile communications service.

In view of the above, it is submitted that rejected claims 25, 28, and 30 are fully supported by the original specification and therefore meet all of the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 25-31 have again been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 for the reasons stated in section 6 on pages 4-18 of the Final Office Action. This rejection is identical to the rejection contained in the previous Office Action and accordingly, the arguments with regard to the traversal of this rejection, contained within the previously filed Appeal Brief are incorporated herein by reference.

In view of the above, reconsideration and favorable action upon all of the claims now present in the application is respectfully requested.

A Request For Reinstatement of the Appeal and a Supplemental Appeal Brief are submitted concurrently herewith.

No fee is incurred by this Request for Reconsideration After Final.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. E. Bushnell", is written over a horizontal line.

Robert E. Bushnell,  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Registration No.: 27,774

1522 "K" Street N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56258  
Date: 7/13/05  
I.D.: REB/HZ